DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 104 CS 503 590

AUTHOR Salem, Philip
TITLE For the Primacy of Speech Communication in Organizational Communication.
PUB DATE Dec 77
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (63rd, Washington, DC, December 1-4, 1977).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; Models; *Organizational Communication; Research Methodology; Research Needs; *Speech Communication; Theories

ABSTRACT

Based on a review of all organizational communication research published in 33 professional journals between 1966 and 1978, this essay describes the current status of the investigation of organizational communication. The first part of the essay is organized around Elwood Murray's model of a discipline and employs the typologies suggested by G. Goldhaber in 1974 and F. Kast and J. Rosenzweig in 1970. It examines (1) the internal/external, formal/informal, verbal/nonverbal, dyad/small group/public, and network domains of organizational communication research; and (2) the organizational units that have been studied, which include goals, structure, technology, psycho-social systems, and management. This first section concludes with the observation that organizational communication research is a maturing area of study that has not yet satisfied the criteria for calling it a discipline. The second half of the essay reviews salient features of the classical study of speech communication--including domain, theory, research methods, application, and ethics--and notes that the emerging discipline of organizational communication has much to gain by employing these features of the classical model. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED207104

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

For The Primacy of Speech Communication in Organizational Communication

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Philip Salem
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Philip Salem

(Ph.D., University of Denver, 1974)

Assistant Professor

Department of Speech Communication and Theatre Arts

Southwest Texas State University

San Marcos, Texas 78666

CS503590

Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association in convention at Washington, D. C., December, 1977.

INTRODUCTION

Humans organizing for their mutual benefit is as least as old as the first hunting parties. Planning for combat or for simple survival in the wilderness requires some minimum systematic analysis of how organizing is accomplished. The investigation of organizing behavior predates history.

The human communication system may be the identifier of the species. The codified systematic analysis of speech is at least as old as Greek civilization. The investigation of communicating behavior is not a new endeavor.

The investigation of organizational communication is, however, a comparatively new phenomena. Although the organizational researcher often must account for communication behavior and although the communications researcher must often attend to organizational and organizing phenomena, it is only in recent times the the hybrid, organizational communication has become theprinciple focus of some investigation. The ways in which some speech scholars have approached this investigation were presented at a recent post-doctoral program in San Marcos, Texas.

The purposes of this eassay are as follows: 1) to describe the current status of the investigation of organizational communication and 2) to argue that that investigation has much to gain from the classical speech model of human communication.

A REVIEW OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

The SCA/SWTSU Conference and Post Doctoral Program was organized around the proposition that organizational communication is a discipline. A discipline is a unified body of knowledge possessing a specified domain, a theoretical foundation, various methods of research, a system of application and a method of criticism or evaluation (Murray, 1972). The notion of discipline has recently been used to orient students to group communication (Goldberg and Larson, 1975). The notion of discipline enables one to raise questions, to define the problem, to orient to the task.

Employing the notion of discipline enables one to direct the reflective process at answering five specific questions: 1) What is the domain of organizational communication; 2) What theories are central to this body of knowledge; 3) What research methods are employed; 4) How can knowledge, gained by research, be applied; 5) What critieria can be used to evaluate research and application. To orient myself to this conference I conducted a survey of literature published in professional journals over the previous ten years (1966-75). That review has been updated; the current review surveyed materials from 1966 through 1978.

With the help of Gail Hudson, a graduate research assistant, I checked every issue of the following journals:

1) All the speech journals listed in the Index to Journals in Communication Studies Through 1974.
2) Human Communication Research
3) Journal of Applied Communications Research
4) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology
5) American Journal of Sociology
6) American Sociological Review
7) Behavioral Science
8) Human Relations
9) Journal of Applied Behavioral Science
10) Journal of Applied Psychology
11) Journal of Conflict Resolution
12) Journal of Experimental Social Psychology
13) Journal of General Psychology
14) Journal of Personality
15) Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
16) Journal of Psychology
17) Journal of Social Psychology
18) Psychological Review
19) Science
20) Social Science Quarterly
21) Sociological Quarterly
22) Academy of Management Journal

Additionally, we "spot checked" the following journals to discover only exceptions to conclusions based on the more thorough review:

1) Journal of Industrial Psychology
2) Personnel Psychology
3) Administrative Management
4) Administrative Science Quarterly
5) Advanced Management Journal
6) Harvard Business Review
7) Human Organization
8) International Management

9) Journal of Systems Management
10) Marketing Communication
11) Public Relations Journal

DOMAIN

What do you study when you study organizational communication? Domain refers to the phenomena under investigation. Domain should not be confused with theory. A theory is a set of relational statements (Dubin, 1969; Dance and Larson, 1976); what the statements relate indicates the domain. For example, to state that the clarity of internal communication is related to organizational complexity implies a domain consisting of the following: Communication clarity, internal communication, and organizational complexity.

The Oral Software Message Paradigm of Goldhaber (1974) suggests that the domain of communication consists of the following: formal and informal networks, internal and external message flows; verbal and nonverbal messages; task, maintenance, and human message purposes; dyadic, small group, and public communication contexts. In cataloging the subject matter currently being taught in organizational communication classes, Downs and Larimer (1974) suggest further additions to this list of units in the domain. No list can be exhaustive, but the combination of lists provides a perspective for viewing research. A particular journal article was assumed to be about organizational communication if one of the units under investigation could be judged as part of this combined list or if one of the units under investigation was simply called "communication."

Kast and Rosenzweig (1970) list five attributes of an organization: goals, technology, structure, psyco-social system, and management. These attributes are defined in such a way that nearly all of organizational research may be classified as falling within the definitional boundaries of one of these attributes. For the purposes of this review, a study was judged to be

an organizational study if one or more of the units investigated could fall into the Kast and Rosenzweig scheme or if one or more of the units under investigation was simply called "organizational."

Communication Units

Internal/External. Internal communication involves only members within an organization; external communication involves at least one communicator who is not a member of the organization.

Research about external communication is scarce. Brown (1969) dealt with an organization's capacity to store and distribute information from a dynamic environment. Drabek (1969) explored an organization's capacity to act on environmental data presented under stress. Pruden (1969) studied the effect of a type of cognitive dissonance on sales personnel. Wren (1967) presented some problems involved in interorganizational coordination. These studies represent a focus on the links between an organization and the environment, the public, and other organizations.

The remaining research cited in the communication units section may be considered as studies of internal communication.

Formal/Informal. An organization may be considered as a contrived system of roles (Katz and Kahn, 1966). When an individual communicates as part of an organizational role, the communication is considered to be formal. Any other communication is considered to be informal.

There is little research concerning informal communication. Roebuck and Spray (1967) attempted to describe cocktail lounge communication. Dee (1968) concluded that a significant portion of an active union member's communication is informal. Recently, Beaver and Jandt (1973) studied the effects of a rumor, and Rudolph (1973) measured the effectiveness of the "grapevine".

Some studies describe a shift from one type of communication to another. The choice of one channel over the other has been related to technological

change (Champion, 1967), to status difference (Graves, 1972) and to performance ratings (Jain, 1973).

The research noted in the internal/external section is research about formal communication. The remaining research cited in the communication units section may be considered studies of formal communication.

Verbal/Nonverbal. Verbal communication is languagelike, e.g. memos, conversations, speeches, etc. (Goldhaber, 1974). Nonverbal communication is non linguistic and generally refers to such behaviors as touching, voice inflection, kinesics, proxemics, etc.

Cummings, Pittuber and Arendt (1974) and Golde (1972) noted the influence of space in group decision making. Willeges, Johnston, and Briggs (1966) compared the effectiveness of vocal communication in the organization have appeared recently in the journals.

Some research focuses on communication style, a combination of verbal and nonverbal communication. Some styles are information seeking or information giving (Wage, 1972), authoritarian, persuasive or participative (Tursjarajen and Deep, 1970), or powerful or powerless (Kipnis andCosentino, 1969). There are project manager styles (Germill and Tharhain, 1974) and bargaining styles (McKersie, 1965).

The principle difficulty with communication style is that it is often measured as a perceived style. Gentry and Kenny (1965) indicate that there are critical factors which affect style perception.

Unless specifically noted, the studies cited in the communication units section are studies employing verbal communication.

Dyad/Small Group/Public. One person communicating to just one other person is called dyadic communication. A small group is a number of persons who communicate with one another, often, over a span of time, and who are few enough so that each person is able to communicate with all others face-to-face

(Homans, 1950); most small group research deals with 3 to 15 member groups. Public communication occurs when one person communicates to many.

Some studies relate the frequency of dyadic communication to organizational norms (Dewhirst, 1971). However, the majority of dyadic research is directed at the superior-subordinate relationship; important factors in superior-subordinate communication are the use of threats (Kay, 1965), influence (Turajarajen and Deep, 1970), job satisfaction (Burke and Wilcox, 1969), the superior's credibility (Falcione, 1974a), and the subordinate's satisfaction with the supervisor (Falcione, 1975b).

The majority of recent organizational communication research is devoted to the small group. Research about the decision making process is common, e.g. Delbecq, 1967; Holloman and Rendrick, 1972; Van de Van and Delbecq, 1974 Leadership, especially Fiedler's contingency approach, is another popular area of investigation (Hill, 1969). The tendency of groups to shift toward a risky consensus is studied (Cecil, Cummings, and Chertkoff, 1973). The list is endless.

When one person speaks to many persons, the result is public communication. There are few recent studies of public communication. Haakenson (1965) examined public speaker training and will be more closely examined in the section on application.

Network. Network refers to the pathway of communication (Goldhaber, 1974). When supervisors direct messages toward subordinates, the network is downward. When subordinates direct messages toward supervisors, the network is upward. If members of equal status direct messages toward each other, the network is horizontal. The notion of network is a uniquely organizational distinction, and as an area of research, this context is second in popularity only to small groups.

Downward and upward networks occur least frequently (Wickesburg, 1968). The efficiency of any one network is dependent on the nature of the message content and the quality of the method of message transmission (Melcher, 1967).

The amount and nature of network blocks is associated with the extent of organizational control (Julians, 1966). Organizational structure is associated with the use of particular networks (1969). Multidirectional networks affect the extent of organizational consensus (Zaeglin, 1972). Environmentally initiated stress affects network effectiveness (Drabek, 1969). Trust also affects network over another and the effectiveness of networks, in general, has been a significant area of investigation.

Davis (1968) concluded that routine information was lost in the downward network. The clarity of upward communication is associated with trust (Roberts and O'Reilly, 1974), the span of control (Brewer, 1971), an employee's sense of insecurity (Athanassides, 1973), and the employee's perception of autonomy (Athanassides, 1974). Furthermore, the availability of upward networks is associated with worker satisfaction (Harriman, 1974). It appears that studies which attempt to measure networks in general are losing popularity to more in depth investigations of particular networks (Roberts and O'Reilly, 1978; Goldhaber, Yates, Porter and Lesniak, 1978).

Etc. Some units mentioned by Downs and Larimer (1974) and Goldhaber (1974) are not used in this review of communication units because research in these areas is not common or because the suggested units seem to be more accurately organizational units. Hage, Aiken and Marrett (1971) were one of the few researchers to employ a classification of messages according to purpose, for example, and units such as motivation and conflict reduction will be explored when dealing with the psycho-social system of organizations.

Organizational Units

Goals. The desired outcomes of an organization are the organizational goals. The influence of communication in goal clarity (Wieland, 1969) and changing existing goals (Drabek, 1973) has been studied, but the relationship of communication to goals is not a popular area of investigation.

Structure. The established pattern of relationships among organizational components is the organizational structure (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1970). The case and adequacy of communication may vary as a function of the structure's formality (Aiken and Hage, 1968; Hall and Johnson, 1967), complexity (Hall and Johnson, 1967; Hage, Aiken, and Marrett, 1971; Goodman, 1970) and of the structure's extent of centralization (Jones, 1969; Brewer, 1971). Although there are few studies whose focus is structure, structure is implied in the notion of network.

Technology. Technology refers to knowledge or the employment of knowledge to perform certain tasks (Kast and Rosenzweig,1970). The principle concern of researchers of technology is efficiency. Since most studies of communication network studies may be seen as technology research.

Cook (1968) related communication to increased sales, but research which relates communication to a particular technology is uncommon.

Psycho-Social System. Studies of the individual in social relationships are psycho-social reserach (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1970). The psycho-social system includes such things as status, roles, worker satisfaction, conflict, etc. The psycho-social system is one of the most popular areas of investigation.

Communication has been associated with organizational climate (Hall, 1974; Maber and Piersol, 1970), status (Champion, 1972; Groves, 1972), conflict reduction (Blake, 1965), worker satisfaction (Burke and Wilcox, 1969), person perception (Golembiewski and Blumberg, 1968), attitudes of managers toward each other (Ivencevich, 1974) and employee attitudes toward the organization (Hand, Richard and Slocum, 1973). These are some of the more representative units, but a list of psycho-social units investigated would be endless.

Management. The principle concern of management is decision-making (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1970; Katz and Kahn, 1966). Communication research has generally focused on two areas: 1) methods of decision-making and 2) leader-

ship. Delbecq (1967) is typical of the first concern; leadership studies are so common and so complex that consulting a more comprehensive review such as Stodgill (1974) or Fiedler and Chemers (1974) is recommended. Most small group communication studies may be regarded as decision-making studies. Management and the psycho-social system are the most popular areas of research.

THEORY

A theory is a set of relational statement (Dubin, 1969). A theory is identifiable because a particular unit of domain is common to all the relational statements in the set.

Theories may emerge deductively. A researcher may employ a variety of previously built theories to create a new one. The new theory usually emerges about the interface of the old one (see Hopper, 1976). A rigorous strategy directed at creating testable hypotheses may then be employed (Dubin, 1969).

Theories may also emerge inductively. The interface of a variety of proven experimental hypotheses may suggest a proposition which explains all of the hypotheses. The interface of propositions suggests laws of interaction, and a set of such laws is a theory.

The explanation of a theory is normally reserved for presentation in a book, not in a journal article. How, then, can one evaluate theories by surveying articles which only present experimental hypotheses or empirical propositions? The notion of the efficiency of a law of interaction suggests a criteria for evaluating the nature of theory from the testable hypotheses.

Theories seek to explain a domain and to predict what will occur within that domain. Well developed theories contain both explanatory power and predictive precision. Theories developed deductively often begin with powerful explanations and only imply prediction: it is left to the researcher to state precise experimental hypotheses. Theories developed inductively often begin

with explicit predictions and imply the explanations; the researcher must develop the generalizable explanations. The two notions of power (explanation) and precision (prediction are complimentary since, generally, the most powerful theories generate the most precise hypotheses and since the most precise hypotheses lead to the most powerful explanations. A theoretical law, a proposition or an experimental hypothesis is said to be more or less efficient (Dubin, 1969) to the extent that it is more or less powerful and precise.

The least efficient relational statements only assert that the values of two units are associated in some way, e.g. attitude change is related to speaker credibility. Such statements only assert that the presence or absence of one unit is associated with the presence or absence of the other.

A relational statement may explain or predict the way in which a specific change in the values of one set of theoretical units affects a specific change(s) in the values of other theoretical units, e.g. an increase in an organization's effectiveness at resolving conflict increases worker satisfaction. Such relational statements are said to have directional efficiency.

The third level of efficiency is covariation. Relational statements at this level of efficiency predict and explain the interaction of units across a range of changes. The example, in the last paragraph, of a theoretical statement which had directional efficiency only postulated the relationship resulting from an increase in the value of one of its units; it did not explain the relationship of worker satisfaction to a decrease in the effectiveness of resolving conflict, the effect of an increase or a decrease of worker satisfaction on the effectiveness to resolve conflict, the affect that particular kinds of organizations or organizational enfironments might have on both worker satisfaction and the effectiveness to resolve conflict, etc. Statements postulating covariance are usually difficult to decipher and are most often explained by employing a graph or diagram.

The highest level of efficiency is rate of change, theoretical statements at this level specify, at the very least, a ratio between the amount of change in the values of one set of units and the amount of change covariant in the values of another set of units. Often rate of change is represented by some mathematical formula or formulas.

Presence-absence is the lowest level of efficiency, and rate of change is the highest level of efficiency. The experienced researcher may recognize the movement to increasing efficiency as a movement from simple two factor experimental designs to multiple factor designs, from simple statistical analyses, such as a t-test, to the more complicated statistical analyses, such as multiple regression, or simply as a movement from catagorical to continuous variables.

The notion of efficiency is useful because an explanation of behavioral research implies, at least, the efficiency of a theoretical proposition. The more efficient a theoretical proposition, the more theoretical units and/or the more changes in values of theoretical units are related. The level of efficiency is also related to the accuracy in one's predictions about the values of units.

Most organizational communication research is at a low level of efficiency, i.e. presence-absence or directional. Falcione (1974a) factor analyzed the source credibility of supervisors; this type of analysis is due more to the sophistication of theories of credibility rather than to the sophistication of a theory of organizational communication. There is a trend toward multiple factor ex post facto and post hoc analysis; this indicates a trend toward higher levels of efficiency.

Roberts, O'Reilly, Bretton and Porter (1974) did attempt a theoretical integration. They concluded the following: 1) there are multiple approaches to communication; 2) there are multiple approaches to organizations; 3) the critical theoretical task is one of matching the various approaches to organizations to the appropriate communication perspective. These researchers then

suggested a particular integration of these multiple approaches.

RESEARCH METHODS

This section reviews behavioral methods. Critical and historical methods are reviewed in the criticism and evaluation section.

The most popular method of research is the field study. A quick review of comprehensive surveys of the literature (Carter, 1972; Greenbaum and Falcione, 1975) will confirm this assessment. Goldhaber (1974) devotes two of twelve chapters to an explanation of field studies.

Simons (1966) listed some of the more common problems with field studies. Aside from the lack of control in a field study, a principle problem with typical field studies is their reliance on a variety of questionnaires as indicators of the unit being investigated. Indeed, questionnaires are the principle measuring device in all of organizational behavioral research (Price, 1969). Greenbaum (1974) suggested the communications audit as an alternative method.

Fiedler's contingency model has been the focus of the most criticism of a particular research method (Mitchell et al, 1970).

A real problem in analyzing behavioral methods is the seeming unwillingness of researchers to share their methods (see Thompson and Vroom, 1967).

Ackoff and Emery (1972) assert that the key to organizational research is in the refinement of laboratory simulations.

APPLICATION

Organizational communication research and theory has had two principle areas of application: 1) application to education and 2) application to the organization. There have been two methods of organizational application: 1) short-term practical (training sessions, sensitivity groups, etc.) and 2) long term analytical (extensive consultation with an organization to areas of change).

Downs and Larimer (1974) and Knapp (1969) describe the current status of educational application.

There are many reports of the effect of short-term practical organizational application. There are some training programs directed at improving public speaking ability (Haskenson, 1965) or language use (Mollen, 1969). Most training programs employ sensitivity sessions to improve interpersonal relations (Beckhard, 1966; Blake, 1965; Davis, 1967; Golembiewski and Blumberg, 1968; Golembiewski and Blumberg, 1969; Golembiewski et al, 1971; Hand and Slocum, 1970; Hand, Richards, and Slocum, 1973; Hillebrandt and Stinson, 1971). This reliance on sensitivity sessions continues in spite of reports which suggest that such training can be harmful (Paul and Porte, 1967) and that such training is really not valued by management (Kearney and Morten, 1974).

There are very few reports of the results of long-term analytical consulation.

CRITICISM AND EVALUATION

Critical research and the development of critical standards have long been a major part of the speech communication tradition (Goldberg and Larson, 1975). Criticism may take the form of an explicit statement of criteria and direct evaluation (Steel, 1971). More often, however, critical standards emerge from an analysis or purposeful review of literature, e.g. this paper, or from descriptive surveys (Knapp and McCrosky, 1968).

Management spends half a billion dollars, annually, communicating to its employees (Fisher, 1965). In some large industries, seventy-five percent of the work assignments are communicated orally (Brenner and Sigbrand, 1973). When is organizational communication good? What are the critical standards? Few articles deal with these important questions.

CONCLUSIONS

Organizational communication is currently the study of verbal communication within an organization. Research is directed at explaining the small group and communication networks. Communication units are often related to the psycho-social and management systems of an organization and to the efficiency of an organization's technology.

Current research tests theoretical propositions possessing a low level of efficiency. It may be concluded, therefore, that most current research operates from a theoretical base which lacks power or precision. The situation is improving, however.

Although some laboratory research does occur, current behavioral studies of organizational communication are field studies. The principle difficulty in field work appears to be a heavy reliance on the questionnaire as an indicator of theoretical units. Alternative methods of measurement have been suggested.

The principle application of organizational research involves human relations training in the organization. Although many sudies verify the usefulness of such programs, the training is not always useful or desirable.

Few scholars approach the area from a critical or evaluative perspective. The importance of communication to the organization suggests the need for creating critical standards.

Organizational Communication is currently an exciting and maturing area of study. The growth of this area in the last decade suggests that it is approaching a state that will soon satisfy Dr. Murray's criteria for a discipline. The potential of the area is only limited by the researcher's ability to ask questions or, in the final analysis, by the researcher's curiosity.

THE ADVANTAGES OF THE CLASSICAL MODEL

Organizational communication is an emergent discipline. This portion of the essay will suggest much can be gained by incorportating aspects of the classical model of speech communication. Again using Murray's distinctions, I will present salient aspects of this classical model and suggest the advantages to be gained from incorporation.

Public communication, public speaking, was the initial domain of speech communication scholarship. Theories were developed with an eye toward practical principles; more energy was spent on the logical development of principles rather than on the systematic collection of data. Dialectical and historical research methods were the norm. Application was straightforward and aimed at "the good man speaking well." It is perhaps, only because that a new synthesis must begin as an antithesis (Hegel) or that new philosophy must start as anti-philosophy (Ortega y Gasset) that so many negative things have been written or said about this fine tradition.

DOMAIN

Although there are many aspects of the classical domain, two are most important for this essay: a) the assumption of intent and b) the importance of the message. In the classical model the speaker was thought to be purposeful, to have a goal(s) and to actively pursue that goal. The most obvious solution to a poor speech was to change the speech. Afterall, the clients of the classical scholars were not speeches wanting to know how to find the best speakers.

For organizational communication a sensitivity to intent means that the scholar begins with an analysis of those items or artifacts of the organization which are produced by the humans themselves. The scholar begins by a consideration of the proactive environment and not the reactive one (Weick). An analysis of organizational constraits without attention to the desired values of desired

traits is as useless as an audience analysis conducted without knowing the speech topic or the intent of the speaker.

Contemporary speech communication educators evidence this sensitivity to the "intentional domain" in instruction directed at improving group decision making and at improving argumentation and debate. In these activities "intentional domain" becomes a problem orientation. Research in both activities is directed at solving a problem or answering a question. The boundary of the research is fairly discrete; the student discards data not related to the defined and limited problem. The problem is defined, in one way or the other, as an unsatisfactory attempt at a goal.

The advantage of this type of boundary specification is that research is purposeful, as purposeful as the roots of the domain. Rules for including/excluding elements from the domain are easily created and usuable. What is germane is what helps answer the question, helps accomplish the goal.

One intentional variable is the message, the speech. Creating a boundary around messages has the advantage of behavioral identifiability. The boundary is more definite.

In trying to identify the domain of organizational communication, I employed Goldhaber's Paradigm. This model presents traits of messages, i.e. messages are easy to use because they relate to observable phenomena. The speech act, the message, in all its various guises, is an identifiable attribute of communication.

There is no comparable unit for "organization". What necessary and identifiable behavior must be present for organization? What is the behavioral indicator of management? The review of domain from Goldhaber's categories was easier than from Kast and Rosenzweig's.

Organizational communication should, therefore, constitute its domain by selecting message elements relative to a goal. Additional units should be included based only on the units ability to solve the problem or answer the

research question. By adopting such an approach, a discipline gains a more identifiable and usefully limited domain.

THEORY

Classical rhetoric is rooted in philosophy. The earliest principles were couched in logic and presented in dialectual fire. Because the rigor was spent in the deductive process, classical rhetoric produced powerful but imprecise hypotheses.

Adopting a formal posture to theory building would allow for an integration of empirically verifiable hypotheses. Current research suffers from a lack of theory, a lack of formal theory development.

The magnitude of the advantages of a deductively based formal approach to theory building may be demonstrated by citing a most obvious deficiency in contemporary thinking. There is no generally agreed upon typology of organizations; the lack of such a classification makes it impossible to generalize results. Current hypotheses lack any power;power is the principle advantage of formalism.

Theory building in organizational communication currentyly operates on a hypothetical/inductive level. What is suggested here is that more attention should be paid to the deductive approach. Theoretical power is the payoff.

RESEARCH METHODS

The classical model is known for historical and critical approaches to knowledge. The relationship between historical and critical is very much the relationship between descriptive and experimental behavioral research. The desired attributes of historical and descriptive research is fidelity and accuracy; relationships between variables are, at best, "suggested" when concluding the research. Relationships are "proven" when compared to an established rhetorical criteria or when tested in the laboratory.

Organizational communication research has been primarily descriptive. One might excuse the lack of experimental research by rightly citing the difficulty in obtaining an adequate sample size of organizations, the ethics of manipulating variables in on-going firms, or the problems encountered in modeling organizational behavior in the laboratory. A most often used compromise is comparative research.

It would be nice if I could point to all the experimental or critical research in speech communication. I cannot. For sometime now, our journals have presented some very sophisticated research in the purification of concepts, constructs, and instruments. When such purification results in testable models, new ground is broken. More often, old relationships are constituted in alternate terminology. Quo vadis?

Experimental and critical research is limited by the ability of a discipline to generate theory. Without the theory, the hypothesis can better be seen as an "I wonder what would happen if ..." speculation. Such speculation would be limited if we all spent more of our time reviewing theoretical research before reviewing the empirical research. The suggestion here is to do more theory based hypothesis testing and less speculating and describing.

The principle advantage of this suggestion is an economic one. The test of an hypothesis is also the test of a description. If an hypothesis fails it may be because of many reasons, but the success of an hypothesis not only leads credence to the relationship but also supports the description that is the basis for the hypothesis.

An often expressed rationale to avoiding experimentation is that the researcher needs more descriptive data before making the hypothesis. What contemporary and classical approaches to speech communication can offer the organizational communication investigator is not only data, but a body of theory from which to generate hypotheses.

The observation is that special attention to speech communication theory will yield more experimental research in organizational communication. The advantage is that more research questions can be tested more economically.

Application

The classical speech scholar conducted research with an eye toward pedogogical application. The speech teacher could turn to the student and say, "If you talk this way, this will be the likely result." Because the speech communication discipline is centered around the message and its circumstances, the application of research has been straighforward and behaviorally compelling.

Other disciplines interested in organizational communication do not contain such straightforward applications. If the recommendation is to change organizational social norms, how is this to be accomplished; if the recommendation is to motivate alternate sets of needs, what behaviors will accomplish this. In nearly every case, at the point of applying theory and research to solving human problems, other disciplines invariably use words like "interaction," "act," "meeting," "relationship," etc. to mean speaking, a behavior other disciplines have not analyzed well.

The advantage of incorporating the classical model's approach to application is a simple one: applications are specific and measurable (also more marketable).

Ethics

Speech communication has many systems of ethics; organizational communication has none. The emergent discipline relies only on a utilitarian measure of excellence.

Organizational literature survived the encroachment of ethics. Kast and Rosenzweig (1970) tried to distinguish Theory X from Theory Y by suggesting that each theory was tied to a more fundamental concept of man. In the end, however, managers do not choose a managerial style because of compliance to their

heartfelt feelings about humanity; a style is judged as more or less useful, profitable. Worker satisfaction ala the Human Relations School was never an end in itself, but only a means to increase production.

Kast and Rosenzweig suggested that an organization, as it reaches its maximum potential, incorporates social and political concerns into its goal structure. I see little evidence of this happening. In an age which is marked by shortages of resources and a real demand for innovation and restraint, we have Henry Ford tell a Meet the Press audience that he has no doubt that automotive safety equipment would not have been inctalled by U.S. companies, if the government had not forced them to. We read that American companies need a monetary incentive to develop alternate sources of energy for American; until the number of consumers decreases, the demand decreases, no financial risk will be taken.

I am not suggesting altruism as an alternative to sound business. I am recommending that the speech communication scholar interested in investigating organizational communication not discard such concepts as free speech, fairness, and tolerance when enjoined in that investigation. One should not discard such concepts because they are ethically right.

CONCLUSION

This essay has described organizational communication as an emergent discipline. Currently, the domain is incomplete, formal theory development is absent, research is too often descriptive, application is limited, and ethics is relatively non-existent. These states are common to embryonic areas of study and scholarly endeavor.

I have suggested that the classical model of speech communication has much to offer organizational communication. The classical model contains a more clearly defined domain, it is steeped in a tradition of formalism, (until recently)

it offers a history of critical research and theory testing, it is centered in specific and compelling applications and it possesses systems of ethics. These classical traits are part of the well known traditions of the discipline.

Although others may argue for the primacy of speech because of theoretical and humanistic necessity, this essay is meant to suggest that scholars not abandon or devalue the classical speech discipline when engaging in a relatively new area of research because of the comparative advantages of retaining the attributes of the tradition. Retention of these attributes will assist in the development of the newer discipline, organizational communication.

References

Ackoff, R. L., & Emery, F. E. On Purposeful Systems. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, Inc., 1972.

Aiken, M., & Hage, J. Organizational Interdependence and Intra-Organizational Structure. American Sociological Review, 1968, 33, 912-930.

Allen, R. R. Hardly Anybody Was Ever Born A College Junior. Spectra, April, 1975, 11, 1-2.

Athanassiades, J. C. An Investigation of Some Communication Patterns of Female Subordinates in Hierarchical Organizations. Human Relations, 1974, 27, 195-209.

Athanassiades, J. C. The Distortion of Upward Communication in Hierarchical Organizations. Academy of Management Journal, June, 1973, 16, 207-226.

Ayres, H.J., Band, V. R., & Faules, D. F. An Assesment of the Flow of Communication Nursing Teams. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 1973, 1, 75-90.

Beaver, C. D., & Jandt, F. E. A Pilot Study in Alienation and Anxiety During a Rumored Plant Closing. Journal of Applied Communications Research, 1973, 1, 105-114.

Beckhard, R. An Organization Improvement Program in Decentralized Organization. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1966, 2, 3-25.

Blake, R. R. The Union Management Intergroup Laboratory. Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 1965, 1, 25-27.

Brewer, J. Flow of Communication, Expert Qualifications, and Organizational Authority Structures. American Sociological Review, 1971, 36, 475-484.

Brunner, M. H. & Sigbrand, N. Organizational Communication - An Analysis Based on Emperical Data. Academy of Management Journal, June, 1973, 16, 323-325.

Brown, W. B. Systems, Boundaries, and Information Flow. Academy of Management Journal, December, 1966, 9, 318-327.

Burke, R. J. & Wilcox, D. S. Effect of Different Patterns and Degrees of Openness in Superior-Subordinate Communication on Subordinate Job Satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, September, 1969, 12, 319-326.

Carter, R. M. Communication In Organizations: A Guide To Information Sources. Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1972.

Cecil, E. A., Cummings, L. L., & Chertkoff, J. M. Group Composition and Choice Shift: Implications for Administration. Academy of Management Journal, September, 1973, 16, 412-422.

Champion, D. J. Some Impacts of Office Automation Upon Status, Role Change, and Depersonalization. Sociological Quarterly, 1967, 8, 71-84.

Cook, D. M. The Impact on Managers of Frequency of Feedback. Academy of Management Journal, September, 1968, 11, 263-278.

Cummings, L. L., Huber, G. P., & Arendt, E. Effects of Size and Spatial Arrangements on Group Decision Making. Academy of Management Journal, September, 1974, 17, 460-475.

Dance, F. E. X. & Larson, C. E. The Functions of Human Communication: A Theoretical Approach. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Davis, K. Success of Chain-of-Command Oral Communication In A Manufacturing Management Group. Academy of Management Journal, December, 1968, 11, 379-388.

Davis, S. A. An Organic Problem Solving Method of Organizational Change. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1967, 3, 3-21.

Dee, J. P. Communication Needs of the Active Union Member. Journal of Communication, March, 1968, 18, 65-72.

Delbecq, An. L. The Management of Decision Making Within the Firm: Three Strategies for Three Types of Decision Making. Academy of Management Journal, December, 1967, 10, 329-339.

Dewhirst, H. D. Influence of Perceived Information Sharing Norms on Communication Channel Utilization. Academy of Management Journal, September, 1971, 14, 305-315.

Dietrich, J. The Parting Shot. Spectra, October, 1975, 11, 1-2.

Downs, C. W. & Larimer, M. W. The Status of Organizational Communication in Speech Departments. Speech Teacher, November, 1974, 23, 325-329.

Drabek, T. & Haas, J. E. Lab Simulation of Organizational Stress. American Sociological Review, 1969, 34, 223-238.

Drabek, T. & Chapman, J. On Assessing Organizational Priorities: Concept and Method. Sociological Quarterly, 1973, 14, 359-375.

Dubin, R. Theory Building. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

Duncan, R. B. Multiple Decision Making Structures in Adapting to Environmental Uncertainty: The Impact on Organizational Effectiveness. Human Relations, 1973, 26, 273-291.

Falcione, R.L. The Factor Structure of Source Credibility Scales for Immediate Supervisors in the Organizational Context. Central Speech Journal, Spring, 1974, 25, 63-66.

Falcione, R.L. Communication Climate and Satisfaction with Immediate Supervisor. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 1974, 2, 13-20.

Fiedler, F.E. & Chemers, M.M. Leadership and Effective Management. Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1974.

Fisher, B.A. Small Group Decision Making: Communication and Group Process. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

Fisher, R.M. Modern Business Speaking: A Rhetorical of Conventional Wisdom. Southern Speech Journal, 1965, 30, 327-334.

Gemmill, G.R. & Thamhain, H.J. Influence Styles of Project Managers: Some Project Performance Correlates. Academy of Management Journal, June, 1974, 17, 216-224.

Gentry, H. & Kenny, J. A Comparison of the Organizational Climate of Negro and White Elementary Schools. Journal of Psychology, 1965, 60, 171-179.

Goldberg, A.A. & Larson, C.E. Group Communication: Discussion Processes and Application. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

Golde, R. Are your meetings like this one? Harvard Business Review, January-February, 1972, 50, 68-77.

Goldhaber, G.M. Organizational Communication. Dubuque, Illinois: William C. Brown Company Publishers, 1974.

Goldhaber, G.M. Organizational Communication: 1978. Human Communication Research, 1978, 5, 76-96.

Golembiewski, R.T., Munzenrider, R., Blumber, A., Carrigan, S.B., & Mead, W.R. Changing Climate in a Complex Organization: Interactions between a Learning Design and An Environment. Academy of Management Journal, December, 1971, 14, 465-481.

Golembiewski, R. T. & Blumberg, A. Persistence of Attitudinal Changes Induced by a Confrontation Design: A Research Note. Academy of Management Journal, September, 1969, 12, 309-317.

Golembiewski, R. T. & Blumberg, A. The Laboratory Approach to Organization Change: Confrontation Design. Academy of Management Journal, June, 1968, 11, 199-210.

Goodman, R. Organizational Preference in Research and Development. Human Relations, 1970, 23, 279-298.

Graves, D. Reported Communication Ratios and Informal Status in Managerial Work Groups. Human Relations, 1972, 25, 159-170.

Greenbaum, H. H. & Falcione, R. L. (Eds.) Organizational Communication Abstracts. Austin, Texas: International Communication Association, 1975.

Greenbaum, H. H. The Audit of Organizational Communication. Academy of Management Journal, December, 1974, 17, 739-754.

Haakenson, R. Training for an Individual Speakers Bureau. Todays Speech, February, 1965, 13, 20-22.

Hage, J., Aiken, M., & Marrett, C. Organizational Structure and Communications. American Sociological Review, 1971, 36, 860-871.

Hall, J. Interpersonal Style and the Communication Dilema: I. Managerial Implications of the Johari Awareness Model. Human Relations, 1974, 27, 381-399.

Hall, R., Johnson, N., & Haas, J. E. Organizational Size Complexity and Formalization. American Sociological Review, 1967, 32, 903-912.

Hand, H. H., Richards, M. D., & Slocum, J. W., Jr. Organizational Climate and the Effectiveness of a Human Relations Training Program. Academy of Management Journal, June, 1973, 16, 185-195.

Hand, H. H. & Slocum, J. W., Jr. Human Relations Training for Middle Management: A Field Experiment. Academy of Management Journal, December, 1970, 13, 403-410.

Harms, L. S. Communication: Rights, Needs and Resources. Spectra, December, 1975, 11, 1-3.

Harriman, B. Up and Down the Communications Ladder. Harvard Business Review, September-October, 1974, 52, 143-151.

Hellebarndt, E. T. & Stinson, J. E. The Effects of T-Group Training on Business Game Results. Journal of Psychology, 1971, 77, 271-272.

Hill, W. The Validation and Extension of Fiedler's Theory of Leadership Affectiveness. Academy of Management Journal, March, 1969, 12, 33-48.

Holloman, C. R. & Hendrick, H. W. Adequacy of Group Decisions as a Function of the Decision Making Process. Academy of Management Journal, June, 1972, 15, 175-184.

Hopper, R. Human Message Systems. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1976.

Huber, G. P. & Delbecq, A. Guidelines for Combining the Judgements of Individual Members in Decision Conferences. Academy of Management Journal, June, 1972, 15, 161-174.

Ivancevich, J. A Study of Cognitive Training Program: Trainer Styles and Group Development. Academy of Management Journal, September, 1974, 17, 428-439.

Jain, H. C. Supervisory Communication and Performance in Urbal Hospitals. Journal of Communication, 1973, 23, 103-117.

Johnston, W. A. & Briggs, G. E. Team Performance as a Function of Team Arrangement and Work Load. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1968, 52, 89-94.

Jones, H. R., Jr. A Study of Organization Performance for Experimental Structures of Two, Three, and Four Levels. Academy of Management Journal, September, 1969, 12, 341-365.

Julians, J. Compliance Patterns and Communication Blocks in Complex Organizations. American Sociological Review, 1966, 31, 383-389.

Kast, F. E. & Rosenzweig, J. E. Organization and Management: A Systems Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Kay, E., Meyer, H. H., French, J., Jr. Effects of Threat in a Performance Appraisal Interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1965, 49, 311-317.

Kearney, W. J. & Martin, D. D. Sensitivity Training: An Established Management Development Tool? Academy of Management Journal, December, 1974, 17, 755-760.

Kibler, R. J. & Barker, L. L. (Eds.) Conceptual Frontiers in Speech Communication. New York: Speech Communication Association, 1969.

Kipnis, R. J. & Barker, L. L. (Eds.) Use of Leadership Powers in Industry. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 460-466.

Knapp, M. L. & McCroskey, J. C. Communications Research and American Labor Unions. Journal of Communication, June 1968, 18, 160-172.

Knapp, M. L. Public Speaking Training Programs in American Business and Industrial Organizations. Speech Teacher, March, 1969, 18, 129-134.

Maher, J. R. & Piersol, D. T. Perceived Clarity of Individual Job Objectives and Group Mission as Correlates of Organizational Morale. Journal of Communication, June, 1970, 20, 125-133.

Marcus, P. M. Union Conventions and Executive Boards: A Formal Analysis of Organizational Structure. American Sociological Review, 1966, 31 61-70.

McBath, J. (Ed.) Forensics as Communication. Skokie, Illinois: National Textbook Company, 1975.

McKersie, R., Perry, C. R., & Walton, R. E. Intraorganizational Bargaining in Labor Negotiations. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1965, 9, 463-481.

Melcher, A. J. & Bellar, R. Toward a Theory of Organization Communication: Consideration in Channel Selection. Academy of Management Journal, March, 1967, 10, 39-52.

Mollenkopf, C. Some Results of Three Basic Skills Training Programs in an Industrial Setting. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 343-347.

Mitchell, T. R., Biglan, A., Orchen, G. R., & Fiedler, F. E. The Contingency Model: Criticism and Suggestions. Academy of Management Journal, September, 1970, 13, 253-267.

Murray, E. Basis for a Discipline of Communication-Epistomology in Interpersonal Communication. Chicago, Illinois: Central States Speech Association, 1972.

Paul, A. & Porte, M. Building Industrial Communication Courses. Journal of Communication, 1967, 17, 250-254.

Phillips, G. M. & Metzger, N. J. Intimate Communication. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976.

Pruden, H.O. Interorganizational Conflict Linkage and Exchange: A Study of Industrial Salesman. Academy of Management Journal, September, 1969, 12, 339-350.

Roberts, K.H., O'Reilly, C.A., Bretton, G.E., and Porter, L.W. Organizational Theory and Organizational Communication: A Communication Failure. Human Relations, May, 1974, 27, 501-524.

Roberts, K.H. & O'Reilly, C.A. III Failures in Upward Communication in Organizations: Three Possible Culprits. Academy of Management Journal, June, 1974, 17, 205-215.

Roberts, K.H. and O'Reilly, C.A. Organizations as Communication Structures: An Empirical Approach. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4, 283-293.

Roebuck, J. & Spray, S.L. The Cocktail Lounge: A Study of Heterosexual Relations in a Public Organization. American Journal of Sociology, January, 1967, 72, 388-395.

Rossiter, C.M. & Pearce, W.B. Communicating Personally. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1975.

Rudolph, E. Informal Human Communication Systems in a Large Organization. Journal of Applied Communications Research, 1973, 1, 7-23.

Scott, R.L. To Burke or Not to Burke: A Brief Note on the Pious NeoBurkeians with a Glance at True Believerism Generally in the Quest for the Perfect Communicology. Spectra, August, 1975, 11, 1-2.

Siegel, J. Machiavellianism, MBA's and Managers: Leadership Correlates and Socialization Effects. Academy of Management Journal, September, 1973, 16, 404-411.

Simons, H.W. Dealing with Disciplinary Diversity. Spectra, 1975, 11, 1-2.

Simons, H.W. Testing Speech Principles in Organizational Settings. Today's Speech, September, 1966, 14, 22-24.

Sloan, T. A Plaque on Both Our Houses? Spectra, June, 1975, 11, 1-2.

Spiller, I. A Study of Communication Processes in Task Oriented Groups. An unpublished M.A. thesis, Southwest Texas State University, 1976.

Stacks, D. W. Organizational Communication: A Survey of Publications. Journal of Applied Communications Research, 1974, 2, 67-74.

Steil, L. K. The Relevance of Modern Organizational Theory to Organizational Communication. Central State Speech Journal, 1971, 22, 78-84.

Stodgill, R. M. Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

Thayer, L. Communication and Organization Theory. Human Communication Theory: Original Essays In Dance, F. E. X. (Ed.), New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.

Thompson, J. D. & Vroom, V. H. (Eds.) Organizational Design and Research. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1967.

Turajarajen, K. M. & Deep, S. D. A Study of Superior-Subordinate Influence and Satisfaction. Journal of Social Psychology, 1970, 82, 173-180.

Van de Ven, A. H. & Delbecq, A. L. The Effectiveness of Nominal, Delphi, and Interacting Group Decision Making Processes. Academy of Management Journal, December, 1974, 17, 605-610.

Wage, L. W. Organizational 'Linking Pins': Hierarchicl Status and Communication Roles in Interlevel Conferences. Human Relations, 1972, 25, 307-326.

Wickesberg, A. K. Communications Network in the Business Organization Structure. Academy of Management Journal, September, 1968, 11, 253-262.

Wieland, G. F. The Determinants of Clarity in Organizational Goals. Human Relations, 1969, 22, 161-172.

Williges, R. C., Johnston, W. A. & Briggs, G. E. Role of Verbal Communication Teamwork. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1966, 50, 473.

Wilmot, W. W. Dyadic Communication: A Transactional Perspective. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1975.

Wren, D. A. Interface and Interorganizational Coordination. Academy of Management Journal, March, 1967, 10, 69-81.

Zoeglin, M. M. An Analysis of Individual Communication Patterns and Perceptions in Hospital Organization. Human Relations, 1972, 25, 493-504.